United Nations A/72/900–S/2018/613

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
21 June 2018

Original: English

General Assembly
Seventy-second session
Agenda item 44
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Seventy-third year

Letter dated 8 June 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 6 June 2018 (see annex), addressed to you by the Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Mehmet Dânâ.

I should be grateful if the present letter and its annex were to be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 44, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Feridun H. **Sinirlioğlu**
Permanent Representative

18-10203 (E) 270618

Please recycle

Annex to the letter dated 8 June 2018 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

6 June 2018

Upon instructions from my Government, I am writing in response to the statements made by the Greek Cypriot Representative in New York during the Security Council open debate entitled "Upholding international law within the context of the maintenance of international peace and security", held on 17 May 2018, which contain unfounded allegations.

It should be underlined, at the outset, that the partnership Republic of 1960, which the Greek Cypriot representative purportedly represents, was destroyed by the Greek Cypriot partner in December 1963, following the attacks on the Turkish Cypriot people and the forceful expulsion of the Turkish Cypriot elements from all state organs, denying them fundamental human rights. As you are well aware, the United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus was deployed against this background. Since then, there has been no single constitutional government representing both peoples of Cyprus or the island as a whole. Each side has since ruled itself, while the Greek Cypriot side has continued to claim that it is the "Government of Cyprus".

The said statements of the Greek Cypriot representative which claim that Turkey violated international law and thus led to the Cyprus problem are far from the truth, as the rightful intervention by Turkey in 1974 was fully legitimate under international law in accordance with Turkey's rights and obligations emanating from the 1960 Treaty of Guarantee. As a result, the Turkish Cypriots were saved from total annihilation and the island's annexation to Greece (enosis) was prevented. In fact, it was the ethnic cleansing campaign instigated by the Greek Cypriots with the ultimate goal of achieving enosis that triggered the Cyprus issue. Hence, the rightful intervention of Turkey was a reaction to, not the cause of, the Cyprus problem. Furthermore, it has to be noted in this regard that none of the Security Council resolutions on Cyprus refer to the presence of the Turkish troops on the island as an "occupation".

As for the issue of the natural resources and wealth around the island, it should be noted that the Turkish Cypriots, as the equal co-owners of the island, are consequently the equal co-owners of the natural resources around the island ab initio ipso facto. In this regard, the consent of both sides has to be sought regarding the exploration, exploitation and marketing of these resources, given that the Turkish Cypriot side has equal and inalienable rights over them. Hence, it is unacceptable for the Turkish Cypriot side to be left out of the energy equation.

In this respect, the oft-repeated Turkish Cypriot proposals for cooperation with a view to equitably managing every aspect of the energy issue or postponing any activity to a time following a political settlement should not be overlooked. Unfortunately, however, it is evident that the Greek Cypriot side has opted for a persistent policy of taking unilateral actions in this matter. Within this context, it should be noted that the activities falsely claimed by the Greek Cypriot representative as acts of aggression and "gunboat diplomacy" in the Eastern Mediterranean are in fact reciprocal actions taken on behalf of the Turkish Cypriot side, the equal co-owner, as a response to the unilateral actions taken by the Greek Cypriot side.

In view of the above, it is clear that the said statements of the Greek Cypriot representative are yet another unfortunate reminder that the Turkish Cypriot people are deprived of their right to be heard at international platforms where the Greek Cypriot representatives regularly exploit their absence to put forward unsubstantiated allegations.

Availing myself of the present opportunity, I would like to call upon the Greek Cypriot side to discontinue such counterproductive and outdated rhetoric, particularly at a time when, in line with your call, the two sides in Cyprus are still engaged in a period of reflection on the reasons behind the failure of 50 years of negotiations to reach a just and viable settlement to the long-standing Cyprus issue. In this regard, the attempts of the Greek Cypriot side to create a fait accompli in the region is to the detriment of both this reflection period and the overall spirit of partnership and equality on matters of mutual interest.

I should be grateful if the present letter would be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 44, and of the Security Council.

Mehmet **Dânâ**
Representative